




Fall 1990

No. 60

Diplomacy World



**AND
THE
WINNER
IS...**



Editor's Desk

Very few of those receiving this issue of *Diplomacy World* are presently subscribing to the magazine. This is due to two factors: 1) issue #60, the first under my editorship, is being sent to everyone in the Hobby for free, and 2) the number of subscribers has gone down significantly over the past year or so. Whatever the reason for this drop in interest, I intend to reverse this trend and make *DW* once again a publication that all Hobbyists will want and need to get.

The purpose of *Diplomacy World* is really quite simple: to promote the play of Diplomacy and related diplomatic games. Articles will focus on the game itself, variants, postal play, tournaments and conventions, ratings systems, and other topics — but the main *raison d'être* for the zine is to provide a common link between Diplomacy Hobbyists and to add to the fun. Whether that makes *DW* the "flagship zine" of the Diplomacy Hobby is subject to interpretation. What I will make *DW* under my editorship is a zine that you will want to subscribe to, one that fills a void in the Hobby at present.

Many of you reading this zine for the first time are new to Diplomacy, and may not even know that a semi-organized Hobby exists for the play of the game. That will change. In *DW* you will learn that there are an awful lot of people like you around the world; people who think Dip is a great game and want to play it morning, noon and night. You will learn how people get together for tournaments and face-to-face

games, how they play by mail and electronic mail, and how they make up variants on the game to add to the enjoyment.

For you veteran Dippers out there, expect *DW* to publish the best strategy and tactics articles available, keep up with Hobby news and announcements, maintain the postal ratings system, and publish variants for you to play face-to-face or to run by mail. Don't expect the same old *DW* that you may have lost confidence in in the past.

If you have seen the zine before, you already know how different my format and contents will be from the *DW* issues that have gone before. My purpose is to professionalize this zine as much as possible — to make the zine into something the Hobby can be proud of and feel comfortable showing to non-Hobbyists. I have slashed the sub rates by 50% or more, and have moved to cheaper postal practices and publishing processes. Most of all, I hope to restore faith in *DW* and hope for the future of one of the Hobby's few zines devoted exclusively to the enjoyment and welfare of Diplomacy Hobbyists everywhere.

If you like what you see, send a subscription check right away. If you don't, send me a letter telling me why and I'll try to improve. If you want to write for *DW* or join its staff (I have openings for Variant Editor, Interview Editor, International Editor and Email Editor) let me know ASAP. If you have a reaction to something you see, write it down and I may print it. Most of all, keep in touch, and don't forget the cheese.

DipWorld

Editor and Publisher	David Hood 104-F Terrace Drive, Cary NC 27511
Assistant Editor	Michael Lowrey 3241-G Walnut Creek Pkwy, Raleigh NC 27606
Strategy/Tactics Editor	Mark Berch 11713 Stonington Place, Silver Spring MD 20902
Contributors	Jim Burgess, Pete Clark, Don Del Grande, Michael Hopcroft, Eric Klien, Andy Lischett, Phil Reynolds, Robert Sacks, Randolph Smythe, Jim Yerkey
Subscriptions	Four issues for \$10 in USA, \$15 in Canada or for Overseas surface mail, \$20 Overseas air mail. These rates are subject to change. The last issue in one's subscription will appear on the mailing label, so remember to keep the subscription current.
Contributions	Submissions are encouraged, and published articles will result in subscription credit being awarded to the writer, as well as recognition above as a <i>Diplomacy World</i> contributor.

© 1990. Articles may not be reprinted without permission from the publisher.

Contents

2	Editor's Desk		
3	Hobby News	Gab on Hobby Happenings	David Hood
4	Interview	With Eric Klien	
6	Strategy/Tactics	The Lisbon Leapfrog	Mark Berch
7		Game on the Edge of Forever	Jim Burgess
10		Diplomacy Metaphysics	Michael Hopcroft
11	Variant	Fog of War Diplomacy	Phil Reynolds
12	Hobby News	CADs Dominate at AtlantiCon	David Hood
14	Demo Game	Winter 1904 / Spring 1905	Randolph Smythe
15	Ratings	And the Winner Is...	Pete Clark
17		Proposed DipCon Scoring System	Jim Burgess
18		Dragonstooth Postal Ratings	David Hood
19		Best Dippers in the World: 1989	Don Del Grande
20	Hobby News	* Jim and Dan Do Atlanta	Jim Yerkey
22		AtlantiCon's Replacement Players	Robert Sacks
23		A Defense of the System	Robert Sacks
24	Zines	Reviews and Announcements	David Hood

Hobby News

Much of this issue of *Diplomacy World* is devoted to Diplomacy tournaments and related issues, but even so there was lots of such material that I didn't have room for. Reviews of PoolCon, MadCon and PeeriCon do not appear but I will briefly mention them here. Vince Lutterbie ran PoolCon once again at his home in Missouri (1021 Stonehaven, Marshall MO 65340). Many of the brightest names in the Hobby were there to play Dip, Acquire, Titan and lots of other games next to Vince's pool. Reviews of the Con have appeared in Vince's zine *Down at the Mouth*, Michael Lowrey's *Carolina Command & Commentary* (3241-G Walnut Creek Pkwy, Raleigh NC 27606) and in Marc Peters' *So I Lied*.

Speaking of Marc, his annual MadCon went off without a hitch again in late July, with some 20-25 participants showing up at his suburban Wisconsin abode (370 North St, Sun Prairie WI 53590). Titan was the main game of choice, but Diplomacy, Railway Rivals, and Bridge were also played. MadCon, which hosted the 1987 DipCon, was reviewed in both *So I Lied* and *Down at the Mouth*.

Three Cons which have not been talked about yet in the Hobby press are PeeriCon in San Diego, CanCon in Toronto, and TwinCon in Minneapolis. We do know that Cal White

won CanCon and that Dave Villadson took top honors at PeeriCon. Both tournaments drew around 20 players.

Once item you will want to take note of right away is the **Titan National Tournament**, to be held October 5-7 at the University of Virginia in Charlottesville. The tournament will consist of both individual and team competitions, with a scoring system awarding points only to the winner of a given game, with different point values awarded based on number of players in that game. Registration is only \$3 for the whole weekend, with accommodations in the area ranging from cheap to fairly expensive. For more information contact Brian Bouton, 1816 Yorktown Dr, Charlottesville VA 22901, (804) 293-9705.

The 1991 North American Diplomacy Championships will be held in conjunction with the Canadian National Tournament CanCon, probably in late July or early August. More details will follow in later issues of *DW* as the Hobby gears up for the first DipCon ever held outside the United States. For now contact Doug Acheson (Unit 5 Suite 300, 320 Yonge St, Barrie Ontario, L4N 4C8) for more information. The 1990 DipCon in Chapel Hill drew over 110 participants — the official results booklet is available for \$1 from David Hood at the *Diplomacy World* address.

The DW Interview: Eric Klien

Q. What is your age and occupation?

A. I am 24 and a computer programmer.

Q. How long have you been in the PBM/PBEM Diplomacy Hobby? How did you first get involved?

A. I got in the hobby in the spring of 1988. I got started in *Rebel* shortly after it was mentioned in Avalon Hill's magazine *The General*.

Q. How old are your two zines *Protocol* and *Electronic Protocol*, and how many games have you or are you running?

A. *Protocol* started February 1989, while *Electronic Protocol* started in October 1988. I have 8 games in *Protocol* and 40 games in *Electronic Protocol*.

Q. Describe your initiative to attract novices to the hobby, and report on the results of said initiative.

A. I currently run ads in *The General* and *Paper Mayhem* with success. Flyers and ads in *The Space Gamer*, *Strategy and Tactics*, *Battle Plan*, and some University newspapers were complete failures. Most of my subscribers are from free ads that I post weekly to the Usenet electronic mail network. I am raising money for a full page ad in *Paper Mayhem*, so would appreciate contributions.

Q. How does the Portal network connect with other PBEM Diplomacy players? Is there significant crossover between PBEM players on different networks?

A. Portal (the network I use for *Electronic Protocol*) connects up to Usenet, which is the largest network in the world. I have one CompuServe GM who uses an undocumented link to hook up to Usenet. But there has been no mass migration from CompuServe to my zine even though I am larger and cheaper. Note that advertising Portal on CompuServe would be frowned upon by the CompuServe authorities.

Q. Will PBEM take over the Diplomacy hobby eventually, and some have suggested, or is there a reason for having games or zines run by conventional mail? For example, is there a satisfactory way to transmit "reading zines" by Email without the reader having to scroll down the screen and develop eye strain?


A. I think PBEM will takeover completely. Remember that you can print out zines sent via Email if you are worried about eye strain. And you can print them out in larger type than most postal zines use. More importantly, PBEM is much faster! I have games with only two day deadlines between turns. It will take longer than that for this letter to be delivered to you by government-controlled snailmail.

The only hope for snailmail is if the government gets out of the business. Rabbitmail with delivery times of one day for all US mail could keep the postal hobby alive, although it is still much easier to post one copy of my zine to Usenet than to print out 250 copies, staple them, put them in labeled envelopes, and then put all 250 stamps on the envelopes. Remember that you would be doing all this work at least four times a month to do the faster pace of your zine. And you wouldn't even want to think of the work involved in doing this for a 500 copy circulation! And my fast international games would still be impossible unless all government converted to rabbitmail, which would involve two-day turn around for international mail compared to the two hours the international Email currently takes. (Email is getting so fast that complete games in one session are becoming feasible on more and more networks; one day the delays will drop to less than one second for Email worldwide.)

Q. Are Diplomacy variants popular on the Email networks, and if so, which ones?

A. Gunboat is the most popular variant. I also run blind games, 1914 games, and the original classic game. I also run games in French and Dutch if you consider that a variant. I almost have enough people for my first German-language game!

Q. Describe your famous "no-NMR" policy and its implementation. Have there been any problems or complaints?



Interview

A. My no-NMR policy has gone quite well. Occasionally there are complaints, but since my competition has gone from 15 GMs down to about 3 GMs on Usenet, most if not all people like to play in my games. Considering that Email connections can suddenly die just as postal mail can be lost, it is important to maintain my no-NMR policy. I have thrown out lots of people for being incompetent, but I never NMR them!

Q. Are conventional Diplomacy games by mail worth the wait, or do they just last too long for someone used to playing Email games?

A. Conventional Diplomacy games by mail are just too slow. The games take forever to finish. I bet most people burnout before their first game comes to conclusion.

Q. How would someone who knows little about Email get involved in Email Diplomacy? Describe the basic procedure for running games on Email.

A. To get involved in Email Diplomacy, the person should find out if they can get a free Usenet account. All universities and lots of companies provide them. They should then contact me at eric_s_klien@cup.portal.com. Usenet is also called Internet and Bitnet. If they can't get a free account, they should contact Portal's voice number at 408-973-9111. If they have a CompuServe account they can contact me at >internet:eric_s_klien@cup.portal.com. Games are run the same as in postal zines, except that the GMs directly send results to the players so that people don't wade through one huge zine looking for their results. (This would be ridiculous for 40 games!)

For record keeping purposes, we post the 40 games throughout the seven chapters of my zine, with the seventh chapter mostly being article-based. I have people called guest publishers who take care of the first six chapters. I also have people called scribes who type in articles, people called

Email wizards to help people out with Email problems, and people called archivers who hold copies of all the chapters and issues of my zine. (We're up to issue #193 so this is a lot of info!)

Q. Should ratings systems rate PBM and PBEM games together, or is that just like comparing apples to oranges?

A. No one pays attention to ratings systems so this doesn't matter. I guess you would want to rate them separately since the faster Email games suffer from less dropouts. By the way, Mark Nelson is about to send me an Email article rating all my games if anyone is interested in reading it.

Q. Why are there no Diplomacy Cons in New England? Would you be interested in running such an event in the future?

A. I may run a Diplomacy Con in the future, but since my players are spread out over 13 countries, I really don't have that many New England players.

Q. Please include any other comments you may have about the state of the Diplomacy hobby.

A. I think the BNC and MNC are way too slow. I am owed tens of numbers. This should either be corrected or I should be appointed the Email BNC and MNC. In the meantime, I have been forced to assign "EP" numbers as most of my games don't yet have BNC or MNC numbers.

I think the Diplomacy Hobby will explode as it goes Email. I am starting one game per week this year, and this rate continues to increase as I get more players. (I have 200 players as I type this.) Since postal Diplomacy is so slow, I have closed openings in my postal zine *Protocol*. If anyone needs more players for their postal zine they should let me know (my US mail address is 10 Sinai Circle #B10 Chelmsford MA 01824.) I am currently referring all leads to *Penguin Dip* but that zine won't have openings for long.

Etc.

There were two deaths in the Hobby this summer. First is Brian Wilson, who was involved in several postal games in zines both Canadian and American. He died after a protracted hospital stay, so our hearts go out to his family and friends. Second, Victoria Irving, Kevin Brown's significant other, died of an automobile crash on August 12. Our condolences go out to Kevin, who publishes the United soccer league zine *Pilot Light*.

There were several articles written for this issue of *Diplomacy World* which did not make it into this issue. So, we know some of what will appear in DW#61: Michael Lowrey on the 1990 Runestone Poll, Pete Sullivan on the English MidCon tournament, and David Hood on Why I Hate Triples.

Other articles will probably include Phil Reynolds on "Dip Tips", Melinda Holley on Gunboat Round Robin tournaments and David Hood on How to Become a Hobby Icon. Updated Dragonstooth standings, the next season of the Demonstration game, and another variant will also appear; so all in all DW#61 will be chock-full of good stuff. For now you should expect it by the end of November so it can go out before exams.

If you have an idea for an article for *Diplomacy World* get in touch with the editor about it. Writers will be paid with subscription credit to the zine. Also, there will be a limited amount of space for letters, so if any reader has a strong reaction to any of our articles, write it down and send it in.

The Lisbon Leapfrog

By Mark Berch

No country can equal France in the variety of exotic, but perfectly sensible openings. One of these is the Lisbon Leapfrog which features, in Fall 1901, Fleet Mid Atlantic convoying Army Gascony to Portugal.

There are two scenarios where this can show up. The first, and most important, is where you, the French player, would like more options for Spring 1902. A *lot* more options.


Ordinarily, unless someone has opened to the Channel or Picardy, you can expect your fleet to descend peacefully on one of the Iberian neutrals (Spain or Portugal) in Fall 1901. The problem, as centuries of French players have discovered, is that this gives you a rather restricted list of choices for Spring 1902. In nearly all cases, only three options make much sense:

1. You can move to the Western Med, provided you chose Spain's south coast in Fall 1901.
2. You can use the fleet to take the other neutral. But often this isn't necessary; you took it with an army in Fall 1901. Even if your armies have been engaged elsewhere, the fleet may well be too precious for such a pedestrian duty — one of your builds can often take care of the job. If you do use the fleet to take the other neutral, you're just postponing the problem for a year: what will you do in Spring 1903?
3. The most common choice is to move back to the Mid Atlantic. The problem here is that you won't have anything interesting to attack in the fall. You'll have to content yourself with a positional move — or blocking someone else's move. Your tempo is off; it should be Spring for positional moves, fall for something more lethal.

And that's where the convoy comes in. As we'll see in other essays of this series, the Fall 1901 convoy permits you to make a strong positional move in the Spring of 1902 and not the Fall.

In this case you have significant anti-English options available for Spring 1902: Fleet Mid Atlantic to North Atlantic, Irish sea or English Channel (the later with Brest's support). That's an impressive array and can be well worth the price paid for this opening.

England, of course, is not going to like this opening. If you've got at least decent communication established, you should be able to smooth things over. To begin with, England didn't ask you not to do the opening, right? I've never made such a request as England, nor have I ever heard one as France. Moreover, it's pretty hard to argue that France



shouldn't be allowed to occupy the Mid Atlantic in the opening game. It's very much like asking England not to leave fleet in the North Sea. The Mid Atlantic, like the North Sea is a vital sea space, bordering home centers and gateway provinces. If England ended up a fleet in the North Sea, it's going to be impossible for him or her to argue that the English can leave a fleet in the water but France can't.

The value of this move goes far beyond the tactical. If you are trying to elicit German and/or Russian support for an early alliance against England, this should get their attention. You've clearly positioned yourself to take part in an attack on England — but you won't get into anyone's way. When your letters go out, urging Germany and Russia to build against the English, these missives will have more credibility. This isn't just some new French scheme, designed, perhaps, simply to create discord. It's a plan that you've at least partially committed to. Clearly, the Lisbon Leapfrog gives you a better chance to persuade Germany and Russia that an anti-English alliance can work.

In addition, this opening, provided it doesn't frighten England, makes an English stab feasible. Typically, England will prepare the groundwork for a Spring 1902 stab by proposing that no fleets be built in Liverpool, Brest or London in winter 1901, particularly when England has only one build. This is a very attractive deal for France. England would then stab by building a Fleet Liverpool. If England builds Fleet Liverpool and France doesn't build a fleet, the English player will have to guess in Spring 1902 just to get his fleet out of port, as either Fleet Liverpool to Irish Sea or North Atlantic can be blocked. Even if England happens to have :

fleet in the Norwegian Sea and can thus support himself to the North Atlantic, Fleet Mid Atlantic to Irish Sea will cause problems. In short, even a successful winter 1901 betrayal by England will be less lucrative — and thus less tempting and likely.

In summary, the overwhelming majority of French players who open Fleet Brest to Mid Atlantic will follow up with F Mid Atlantic to Portugal. They must thus spend Spring 1902 undoing that move. If you are willing to forgo the third build, and don't have any serious duties for your armies, you can overcome that loss of tempo with the Lisbon Leapfrog.

The situation for a southern campaign is murkier. F Mid Atlantic is obviously one crucial season ahead of Fleet Portugal. Fleets in the Mid Atlantic and Spain (south coast) have the same access to the Western Med. Fleet Spain (sc) can also move to the Gulf of Lyon or Marseille, which fleet Mid Atlantic cannot, although normally your Marseille build can be expected to handle that. But the extra job that F Mid Atlantic can do is moving to North Africa. This is an advantage in a south where France built Fleet Marseille but not Fleet Brest and Italy has Fleet Tunis. Ordinarily, Spring 1902 could see F Spain (sc) - Western Med, F Tunis-North Africa and Fleet Naples-Tyrrhenian Sea. Assuming Italy has an army prepared to convoy to Tunis this places France in an awkward guess: will Italy send a fleet to the Western Med or Mid Atlantic? If France guesses wrong, it will make no progress in its southern campaign or even have to face a marauder behind its lines. France's options of moving Fleet Mid Atlantic-North Africa in Spring 1902 throws a monkey wrench in Italy's plan here, for she, not France is not doing the guessing. As on the northern front, France's better-placed fleet may make aggression less attractive to its southern neighbor.

There are two final related issues here: what to do with the other army and why not just move Army Gascony to Spain so as not to bother with the convoy. If the army has no other duties, it can zip Marseille-Spain-Portugal. In that case, you

can do Army Paris-Gascony-Spain and dispense with the convoy altogether while F Mid Atlantic holds. This is a close cousin to the Lisbon Leapfrog. This particular configuration is very useful if you suspect that Italy will move to Piedmont in the Fall of 1901. If that happens, both Fleet Mid Atlantic -Western Med and Fleet Marseille-Gulf of Lyon are possible with Army Spain covering Marseille. By contrast, putting the Fleet in Spain in Fall 1901 means one of the two fleets would have to guard Marseille.

Of course, Fleet Marseille holds is a bit conspicuous but you may not have another use for the piece in Fall 1902. The positional advantage is maintained, however.

More commonly, Army Marseille will be in a Spring 1901 standoff in either Burgundy or Piedmont. It can move to Spain in the fall for a second build. You could take Burgundy though this is risky. If you don't get Munich or Belgium, you're going to feel undermanned with just one build.

There is a second scenario for this move. If England has opened to the Channel and you think he will try to go to the Mid Atlantic, the convoy will do the double duty of blocking the move and getting Portugal. This is such an outrageous setup that ordinarily I wouldn't mention it, but it actually happened in 1976JL. The GM (Cliff Mann) would later deny that the French player was his girlfriend, although on at least one occasion, a call to the GM was answered by her. As you can imagine, there were some hard feelings about the game. But I digress.

Admittedly, the Lisbon Leapfrog is an unusual opening, requiring a very particular set of circumstances. But if they do occur, the Lisbon Leapfrog can be just the ticket for a more successful 1902. Keep it in mind the next time the light blue pieces come your way.

➤ Mark Berch (11713 Stonington Place, Silver Springs MD 20902) publishes *Diplomacy Digest*.

Game on the Edge of Forever

By Jim Burgess

Some postal game research probably would verify that *The Aliens' Game* is one of the longest games in Postal Diplomacy history, almost certainly the only game lasting to 1930 or beyond that ended in a win. Mark Luedi GM'ed a game from the late 70's to the early 80's that went to 1927 and ended in a draw. At that time, I remember hearing the rumor that the longest game had ended in 1929, but I have no proof one way or the other. From playing in this game as an Italian

standby and experience in playing long games while in high school, I've found that two characteristics are needed to make a game last this long. First, you must have players willing to change alliances frequently according to the broad strategic situation (and some endurance to keep negotiating seriously even as the balance of power ebbs and flows) and second, you must have players who are playing to win the game! Such a simple thing, yet it is so elusive in so many postal games. In

this game, Jeff Martin (England), Randy Ellis (Austria), and John Huestis (Russia) all entertained serious thoughts of victory at one time or another. Finally, though I took over a two center power from Daniel Scott Palter, this game made it through the 1920's because I, too, was playing for the win or a 17/17 draw. I kept telling Steve Langley that I'd take it to 1940 so we could play the second World War. I was unsuccessful, but I'm happy that I tried rather than taking the four way draw that was offered. If more postal players agreed that a second place going for first or a twoway was better than a fourway draw, we'd have a great deal more exciting postal play.

Steve Langley never published the endgame statements for the game (in fact, BNC Don Williams had to compile the final statistics on the game). I asked Steve if he'd be willing to send me the unpublished endgame statements and he did, so this article partially is based on the comments of Stephen Dorneman (final standby Austria), Jeff Martin (English winner), Mike Pustilnik (final standby France), my own statement (final standby Italy), Andy Lischett (final standby Russia), Steve Langley (GM), plus long discussions between myself and Randy Ellis (who played Austria for the first 18 years). I thank all of them for their helpful comments. I'll begin by summarizing the general progress of the game and then follow with a discussion of some of the interesting points. I took over as a standby in the Spring of 1908, so the early history is entirely based upon Jeff Martin's comments. The initial alliance pairs were Austria/Russia and England/France. The Turkish attack was especially effective, but the EF against Germany was only slightly less effective. Another amazing part of this game is that both Turkey and Germany were gone by 1905. Randy pulled a fake stab on Russia at that point while England stabbed France. Randy's move left all powers on the board clearly enemies of England. To Jeff's credit, he was able to salvage an alliance with Terry Tallman after the original French player dropped out.

Then I came on the scene to take over Italy with two centers. My previous friendships with Terry and Randy helped a great deal to keep me in the game during those crucial early seasons when I fell to holding a single center. I wrote to everyone at least once a season for most of the game (with the exception of periods where I didn't bother to write to England). At this point, we were very close to the classical stalemate lines, but were 22 game years from the end of the game with an England/France vs. Italy/Austria/Russia. But a key factor in the length of the game was that ALL five remaining powers had units bearing on the Straits of Gibraltar. A vast oversimplification would be to say that the next 22 years were played to seal the stalemate line so each of the lines (North and South) set up a single pair of powers facing each other. England finally won the battle. I've seen many,

many Dip games end right here with a four or five way draw. If this article accomplishes anything, I'd like it to convince at least a few players to torture their GMs with very long games instead of bailing out at this point. You'll have a great time and Allen Calhmer will be proud of you.

I made lots and lots of draw proposals; the infamous FAIR, AIR, IRE, FAIRE, and even the FEAR (how could they leave me out) draws. I also vetoed them regularly. One of my strategies from early on was to talk and propose like the player who was interested in draws, but really wasn't. I fooled everyone. No one guessed (from their endgame statements) that it was me who was vetoing all the draws. For that reason, I prefer house rules that make EVERY aspect of draw votes secret except whether or not one passes. It can be a great tool for Diplomacy. DIAS (draws include all survivors) rules are used by some GMs to attempt to generate games like the one played here, but from my view they haven't worked. Only the resolve of players not to accept draws and to play for a better outcome, by taking risks, makes for this kind of game.

John Huestis took over as Russia and Mike Pustilnik took over as France. This portion of the game (from 1911 to 1918) was the most exciting. In the first few years, England,

Game: Aliens (1982CH)
Zine: Down 'N Dirty (to W'06), Magus
GM: Dave Marshall (to W'06), Steve Langley
Result: English Win, Fall 1930

Power	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10
A)	5	6	7	8	9	9	9	9	9	9
E)	5	7	7	8	10	11	11	12	12	11
F)	5	6	7	7	7	5	5	4	3	3
G)	5	3	2	2	0					
I)	4	4	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	2
R)	6	6	7	7	6	7	7	7	9	9
T)	4	2	1	0						
	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
A)	9	9	11	11	11	14	15	15	11	7
E)	10	9	9	10	8	8	8	9	10	12
F)	3	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
I)	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	4	7	9
R)	10	11	10	10	12	8	7	5	5	8
	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
A)	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	1	0
E)	13	16	16	17	16	17	17	17	17	18
F)	1	1	1	1	1	0				
I)	11	10	10	10	11	10	10	11	11	11
R)	6	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	5	5

A) Randy Ellis (Res S18) John Crow (Drp W19) Stephen Dorneman (Elm F30) E) Jeff Martin (Win F30) F) Bob Kraus (Drp S06) Terry Tallman (Drp S11) Mike Pustilnik (Elm W26) G) Peter Robson (Elm W05) I) Dan Palter (Drp S08) Jim Burgess (Srv F30) R) Richard Tucker (Res F08) John Huestis (Drp W24) Andy Lischett (Srv W30) T) Mike Corbett (Drp S02) Mark Keller (Elm W04).

Russia, and Austria all had about ten centers, but tactical and strategic maneuvering was very hot and heavy. Mike set up his last unit in the Iberian peninsula as the crucial linchpin, but toadied to England. In 1915, John Huestis looked like he was going to win. England was losing in the north and the south was locked up (but still with units from five powers all jumbled up). In 1916, Randy debated what to do. One problem with Russia was that he was very uncommunicative. It was impossible to tell whether he would even coordinate with us, let alone fail to stab Austria to go for the solo win. In the first of many such calculations, Randy and I worked out a plan that would keep England from breaking through in the Mediterranean, even if he worked with Russia perfectly (which he didn't) after we applied the stab. Within three game years, Russia was cut from 12 to 5 units while England only gained one. Randy was at 15 centers while I had grown to four.

At this point, Randy knew that personal reasons would force him to resign, but he very kindly left his position with me perfectly set up to stab him (later he told me that he had done this partially on purpose). I did, to the great surprise of John Crow (who probably thought a 15 center standby position was a great deal). John immediately quit and Stephen Dorneman took over. Stephen had some trouble adjusting to the cutthroat nature of this game. There were now four approximately equal powers and the next couple of game years brought many stabs, counterstabs, and realiances. One thing that happened here that is uncommon in most postal games was the willingness to set up a new alliance with someone who had just stabbed you. The idea was to grow through each round of the merry-go-round.

1921 was the key game year that won it for Jeff Martin. Austria had been cut down to three and Russia to six. I was at 11 to Jeff Martin's 13. Russia was the key player that year (still being very uncommunicative). He was going to lose more centers and he was able to decide to whom he was going to lose them. He chose to lay off England and allow Jeff to gain final control of the northern stalemate line. I lost a unit and that basically was it. Jeff Martin was a novice when he began this game and his tactics were a bit weak, so I decided to keep playing for the win. It turned out that (through the course of 30 game years of watching good tactics) he learned just enough to guess right on the final 50/50 chance to win the game.

But we are getting a little bit ahead of ourselves. Jeff almost won in 1924 as he reached 17 for the first time, but he failed to eliminate his loyal French ally, Mike Pustilnik. That choice led to six more years of maneuvering. I managed to take one center and my new Russian ally, Andy Lischett, was able to take another one, so when Jeff took out France he was two short. Now I plotted to take Austria out, too. I think I'll

quote from the endgame statements of Andy Lischett, Stephen Dorneman, and Jeff Martin to tell the story:

Jeff Martin: "A draw seemed certain at this point but, for some reason, it wouldn't pass. Failing that, I knew that the balance of power had to be shaken up or equalized somewhat, so I began to pull units back from the Russian front. To my surprise, Russia (now Andy Lischett) did not take advantage of the opportunity. Instead, it seemed to make Russia and Italy feel secure enough to attempt to get rid of Austria and get a three way draw. This was a fatal mistake as it allowed me to swoop past their stalemate line while their backs were turned."

Andy Lischett: "I blew this game...AIR had stalemated England, and we repeatedly proposed an AEIR draw which was repeatedly vetoed...I wrote England (and urged Austria and Italy to write also) vowing that the AIR stalemate line would hold and asking that he vote for AEIR, but someone kept vetoing it. ((Now we know who that was...)) England had pulled away from my borders either to tempt me out of position or to frighten my allies and with him being peaceful, Austria bored, and Italy antsy, I came up with a plan for Italy and me to knock out Austria and keep the stalemate line... Italy quickly agreed, and in Fall 1928 we stabbed Austria. I figured that if England stayed out of Tyo, Boh, and Sil we'd hold the line while hunting down Austria; and that England was likely to stay out of Tyo, Boh, and Sil since he'd been non-hostile for all of '27 and intentionally NMR'ed in S'28. But England did not stay out of Sil in F'28, and now he had a friend (if not an ally) in Austria. Maybe his NMR ruse should have warned me that his peaceful ruse was over, and it did, but not loud enough. However, we weren't dead yet. The IR war against Austria went as expected (Austria and England not coordinating), while he did pretty well at regaining the stalemate line. In Spring 1930 Italy and I had a choice of protecting Mos or War; if we chose the one that England chose to attack, we would keep both and have our stalemate line, otherwise England would win. I chose War, and England chose Mos, and England won..."

When England won, I felt pretty bad knowing that we had stopped him and then (at my urging) blew it. But now, I feel that we did stop him, and then continued the game as it was meant to be played...trying for a better finish. In my 5 game years, this game was a lot of fun, with good tactics, negotiations, treachery, tricks, and GMing. Jim described this game perfectly when he said it reminded him of a wellplayed face-to-face game. Jim was an excellent ally, who was open to ideas and had ideas of his own. He also kept me wondering, by occasionally doing stuff like ask if he should stab me. Steve D. wasn't as good an ally, but he held up his side, and didn't fold up and quit when stabbed." ((I couldn't have said it better, which is why I didn't bother trying. I'll

leave you to wonder what would have happened if we had guessed right and the game had gone on. Stephen's statement makes a good summing up...))

Stephen Dorneman: "According to the Good Book, For we brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out.' And according to the Bad Book (Rod Walker's *The Gamer's Guide to Diplomacy*), The First Commandment in DIPLOMACY is: Thou shalt covet thy neighbor's supply centers.' Therefore, according to both books, I should feel no regret in coming into this game as a standby, (as an Austria that had just been stabbed by Italy) and going out of it by being eliminated in the final season (as an Austria that had just been stabbed by Italy). Still, book learning aside, I feel there was something more I could have gotten out of this alien encounter." ((I hope this article helps, Stephen. I make no apologies for my cutthroat play. Just to add a little balance, I should close with the comment of our eternally patient GM, Steve Langley. I left it out of the quotes above, but everyone had the very highest praise for Steve's work (and the great press, including great guest press from Daf Langley and Linda Courtemanche), we're all very sorry for however much this game contributed to Steve Langley's current burnout...))

Steve Langley: "In the end, it was not Diplomacy so much as greed that gave Martin the win. His play was solid,

and innovative, and despite it all, insufficient. It was the greed of Italy and Russia that spelled their doom. At least that's the way it looked from out here."

Andy Lischett responds:

My only disagreement with Jim's article is with Steve Langley's assertion that Italian and Russian greed gave England the win. Whether or not Italy was greedy, I was not... Unless one considers it greedy to join a stop-the-leader alliance. None of my actions were meant to advance Russia, but to stop England. the only reason I stabbed Austria was that the AEFr draw would not pass, and Steve knew that I pushed the AEFr because I asked if he would impose it.

When AEFr repeatedly was vetoed I joined Italy against Austria not to improve my finish, but again to stop an English win. The AIR alliance was unstable, and it was only a matter of time before Italy did something reckless or Austria NMRed, and I thought England would agree to a 3-way where I'd thought he had been vetoing the 4-way.

> Jim Burgess (100 Holden Street, Providence RI 02908) is the publisher of the *Boob Report* and the *Abyssinian Prince*. Andy Lischett (2402 South Ridgeland Ave, Berwin IL 60402) publishes *Cheesecake*.

Diplomacy Metaphysics

By Michael Hopcroft

Diplomacy is an odd game, and some odd people play it. Being of a philosophical bent by nature, and one who is always willing to look foolish in a good cause, I thought I would speculate for a moment on what the pieces mean.

Suppose the Diplomacy map represented a real world? Suppose the moves made by Dip players were, in some alternate cosmos, **actually happening**?

A real war fought in the manner of a Diplomacy game would be odd. There isn't much historical evidence I can see of countries changing sides in the middle of a modern war. There would be much confusion on the lines were that to happen.

"Say, aren't those our allies marching in?"

"They sure are. But their bayonets are fixed and they don't look happy. I suggest we duck."

Neutral capitals would be a frenzy of activity. Diplomats from all sides would meet in Switzerland in secret to arrange the changes of sides. The dealing would be fast and furious, as great powers suddenly cease to exist.

The war itself may or may not be bloody. Soldiers would seem to be very willing to give up territory rather than get

squashed. Neutral countries, accepting their lot as part of the vast empires, won't resist at all. Maneuver is emphasized over fighting, and when faced with overwhelming odds armies invariably retreat.

How does the individual soldier feel? Caught in seemingly endless fighting against enemies who were once friends, the individual soldier would have to feel his effort pointless.

What about the civilians? War breaks out everywhere suddenly after almost a century of peace, for no reason whatsoever. I'm sure shock would give way to ennui; "So who's conquering us this time, I wonder?" "The English." "Better stock up on tea then."

Only a select, slightly mad few would realize that their world was crumbling because somewhere in the infinity of space-time seven people are playing a game. I know that it would threaten my sanity to realize my universe is merely a game board!

> Michael Hopcroft is the former publisher of *Not Up to Modern Graphics Standards*.

FOG OF WAR DIPLOMACY

© 1989 by Phil Reynolds,
publisher of *Dipadeedoodah!*

1) The 1976 version of Rules for Diplomacy are in effect. Fog of War plays exactly as regular Diplomacy; but the differences lie in what information is reported to each player.

2) A game year will be separated into Winter/Spring and Fall seasons. This should generally not be any more of a problem than in regular Diplomacy. In fact, it will frequently happen that a player will be totally unaware of his enemies' actions.

3) Players do not automatically receive information on the positions of all units on the board. Each of their units "reports" sightings of enemy units to its supreme commander (i.e. the player) at the end of each turn, after all movement and attacks have been resolved.

4) A player always "sees" his own units. Additionally, he sees an enemy unit only if one of his own units could move to the enemy unit's *exact* location in a single move (without convoy). Individual maps for each player should be used to report turn results.

• Example... At the end of a turn, England has F Gas and France has A Par. The French player can see the English fleet, but the English player cannot see the French army (since F Gas-Par is illegal).

• Example... At the end of a turn, England has A Gas and France has F Spa(sc). The English player can see the French fleet, since an army in Spain would be considered to be anywhere and everywhere in the space, but the French player cannot see the English army.

• Example... At the end of a turn, England has F Gas and France has A Spa. The English player can see the French army by the same reasoning as above.

• Example... At the end of a turn, England has F Gas and France has F Spa(sc). Neither player can see the other's unit.

5) Possible convoy routes have no effect on sightings.

• Example... At the end of a turn, England has A Lon and F Eng, while France has A Par. The English player is not notified of the French army's existence.

6) In the cases of units "bouncing" in an attack or one unit is successful but no retreats are necessary, a player will only see those enemy units that are sighted at the end of the attack.

• Example... Italy: F Ion-Tun; France: F Wes-Tun. Both attacks fail, but neither player is made aware of the opposing unit's existence since they do not lie within one legal move of each other. Thus the Italian player will know he failed to take Tun, but not who attacked it or from where. The French player, however, should be able to deduce that the opposing unit came from Ion, but not necessarily who was responsible for the attack.

• Example... Italy: F Ion-Tun; France: F Wes-Tun, F Naf S F Wes-Tun. The French fleet takes Tun, which is noted for Italy because of F Ion. However, Italy is not informed of the supporting unit in Naf, though the Italian player should deduce its existence.

7) In the case that a unit is attacked and holds its ground, the player will be notified of this by "stripling" the attacked space, but making no mention of who attacked or from what space the attack was made.

• Example... Russia: F Rum H, F Bla S F Rum; Austria: A Bud-Rum, A Ser S A Bud-Rum. Russia will see on his map that Rum is "striped", indicating an unsuccessful attack on the space. The Russian player will not even see the Austrian armies on his map, since his F Rum cannot move to Bud or Ser legally.

8) Retreating units are considered to be still in the space from which they are retreating for the purpose of sightings. Thus the defending player will always know the identity of the attacking unit, but not necessarily the space from which the attack came. All other units that are within sighting are likewise noted.

9) A player will not be given a list of possible retreats for a given unit. The reason for this is illustrated by the following example.

• Example... Russia: F Rum H, F Bla S F Rum; Austria: A Bud-Rum, A Ser S A Bud-Rum, F Gre-Bul(ec); Turkey: E Con-Bul(ec), F Ank-Bla. The Russian player must retreat F Rum. His map would show the following information: Austrian A Rum, Turkish F Con and F Ank, Russian F Bla, and a striped Black Sea, with all other spaces empty. Russia is unaware of the standoff in Bul, which appears to be an available retreat in addition to Sev. (Should the Russian player eventually choose to retreat to Bul(ec), his fleet will of course be destroyed.)

10) Conditional orders on an enemy unit's retreat are possible only if the player has a unit within sighting of the anticipated retreat.

• Example... Germany: A Mun-Bur, A Ruh S A Mun-Bur; France: A Bur H; England: A Pic H. The French army must retreat to Bel, Par, Gas, or Mar. The English player could write conditional orders for the unit retreating to Bel or Par, but not Gas or Mar, since these spaces cannot be sighted by A Pic.

11) Conditional orders on another player's adjustments are possible only if the player has a unit capable of sighting the anticipated site of adjustment.

• Example... Austria has F Smy; Turkey has both Con and Ank unoccupied, and is allowed one build. The Austrian player could write conditional orders on the type of unit built in Con, but can write no such orders for any possible builds in Ank.

• Example... Same as the previous example, but Austria also has A Ser and Turkey must retreat F Rum. The Austrian player could add conditional orders on F Rum disbanding or retreating to Bul(ec), but not for it retreating to Sev or Bla.

12) A player will only receive knowledge of the supply centers he owns at the end of the fall season, and not that of other players, unless of course he has a unit within sighting of an enemy unit located in a supply center, in which case it will be noted on the map in the normal fashion.

I believe these rules and examples should answer most of the questions on Fog of War. Later revisions will be made as clarification and playtesting requires.

This variant was originally intended to be played like regular Diplomacy (i.e. players know each other's identity). A gunboat Fog of War is possible, of course, and probably very nerve-wracking! Can you imagine not only being in the dark as to the identities of your fellow players, thus making communication all but impossible, but also being in the fog as to positions of enemy units on the board? Yikes! I guess I'll have to run one to find out!

CADs Dominate at AtlantiCon

By David Hood

I try to make it to one out-of-town Con every summer. Since DipCon was in my backyard this year (actually, I think I was in charge, but my mind is trying to block the whole thing out) I decided it was time to make the trek up to Baltimore again for the annual AtlantiCon tournament. This is one of the big Cons - you know, the kind with 2500 people or so. Problem is that most of these people are roleplayers or miniatures people, so while there is a lot of gaming going on it is not as much as you would expect from a group of people this size.

Anyway, the Carolina Amateur Diplomat (CAD) contingent for the trip consisted of the following rogues: David Hood, worn-out DipCon host who some say is making a one-man bid to run the entire Hobby; Bob Odear, the impatient physical chemist who is dropping out of slow PBM games to play PBEM exclusively; Chris Kremer, the traveling lawyer whose idea of preparing for AtlantiCon was to get about five hours sleep total in the five days before the Con; David Harshbarger ("Harsh"), a UNC Gaming Club denizen and man who prefers frozen yogurt to real ice cream; and Tom Kobrin ("Kobra"), the rare Dipper who also likes to play those Hellish Hitler Hexgames. Michael Pinkerton ("Pinko") was to meet us there - yes, the same CAD who defected to Yankeeland (New Jersey) and who complains about lack of time to play in his one PBM Diplomacy game.

My van rolled out of Durham by 8:15 am, after delays resulting in part from having the wake Chris up and get him ready to go in ten minutes time. Good thing about a van is that it allows gaming to and from Cons - there were two Kremlin games and several Family Business hands completed before we rolled into Baltimore at 1:55 pm, just in time for Kobra and Harsh to make their 2:00 tourneys. Gaming for the rest of us began at 7:00 pm. Chris and I were trounced in the Civilization tournament, but Harsh did well enough in 1830 to advance to the Saturday night round. Pinko also advanced in the Kingmaker event. Late night action included bad pizza and bad Family Business (i.e., I didn't win.)

Saturday noon saw the Diplomacy Round One action. As usual, Robert Sacks was the GM. He set up six boards for Round One, with three boards filled for Sunday's Round Two. Bob and I had argued with Robert about his scoring system earlier Saturday morning — and Robert's intransigence would soon loom large when awards were bestowed the next afternoon...

But back to Round One. There were several strong players whom I knew from past Cons: Frank "Baltimore" Jones, Jim Yerkey, Dan Mathias, Mark Franceschini, Eric

Schlegel, and others. And then there was Jack McHugh and a bunch of other weak players that often grace Diplomacy boards at these big Cons. And then there were five CADs. Bob and Chris each took two-ways, Chris with the eventual tournament champ, Andrew Ofiesh, and Bob with Origins '90 champ Jim Yerkey. Pinko was in a five-way, while Harsh got into a stop-the-leader three-way.

In my game I was glad to see that I knew no one at my board. Diplomacy is often more fun when played with six strangers. As France I opted for my usual strategy of alliance with Germany against England, which John Borkowski (VA) was all too willing to go along with. We were helped by the cooperation of Russia, Matthew Smith (NJ), who went north with an army to St Pete. Poor Randy Cohen (NJ) had little chance for survival as England given the FGR forces arrayed against him.

The east also saw three powers jump on the corner power, Turkey. Gary Andrews (NY) put up as good a defense as he could in his first ever game of Dip, but Russia's Smith, Italy's David Burgess (NY), and Austria's John Downey (NY) chewed him up and he was out by 1903. England survived to 1904 by puppeting to the FG stab of Russia. Smith was knocked down several pegs as he was caught from behind — he had much of his forces in Turkey fighting with Italy over the spoils of their eastern campaign.

As Russia rolled over and died it was time for me to make a decision as France — stab Germany, my erstwhile ally, or head south against Italy or Austria. Turned out my decision was a forced one as Austria had just stabbed Italy and was advancing on Rome/Naples. I figured I better get down there while the gettin' was good, so I built F Marseilles and sent other fleets into Spain and Western Med, moves which could be explained to Italy as intervention on his behalf and to Austria as the promised help from the west against an Italian navy superior to that of the one-fleet Austria. And until I got down there into Tyn, etc. there was no reason for me to decide myself which of those two strategies I would follow.

As Germany advanced into Russian territory the Russians fell back into Turkey and the Balkans, a very good occurrence for the FG in that it precipitated total war between Italy, Austria, and Russia rather than the cooperation needed to prevent an FG draw. Austria and Russia eventually made up and teamed up against Italy, but that was hardly the way to stop my French fleets from controlling the Med!

I decided to ally with Italy to maintain a Balkan balance of power. I took Rome and Tunis at Italy's request, since his

AtlantiCon 1990 Diplomacy Results

Top Three Boards (* means played only one day)					
1.	Andrew Ofiesh	27.250	11.	Frank Jones	15.056
2.	Chris Kremer	26.895	12.	Mark Franceschini	14.923
3.	Robert Odear	25.343	13.	Tom Layman*	14.611
4.	David Hood	23.417	14.	Ben Swift*	13.216
5.	Eric Schlegel	23.146	15.	Carl Willner	12.899
6.	David Harshbarger	23.088	16.	Michael Searle	12.812
7.	Carl Nelson*	19.222	17.	Joe Licata	12.804
8.	David Burgess	17.036	18.	Gerald Todd	12.333
9.	John Borkowski	16.185	19.	James Dickson*	9.812
10.	Jim Yerkey	15.684	20.	Michael Alterio	9.391
			21.	Jeff Jafee*	8.431

successes in Turkey would entitle him to build in Naples regardless of whether he held Tunis (Ven and Rom were held by Austria.) Downey's miswritten orders and faith in my anti-Italian assurances sealed his doom by preventing the naval buildup that might have turned the tide against Italy. By game's end the Germans were marching on Vienna and Sevastopol while my fleets were poised in Ionian and surrounding seas. Italy owned Naples and Turkey, with AR owning the rest of the Balkans. In other words, the east was totally defeated and there was no dissent to the declaration of an FG draw. I think both John and I were considering a stab of each other had the game not ended, resulting in a win for one of us for sure. But we decided to be safe with two-ways and focus on doing well on different boards the next day.

Saturday night saw me play Dune as the Emperor, and saw me realize that I had a very poor grasp of the rules... After my thrashing I went over to Robert Sacks' Hobby Meeting, the usual get-together of East Coast elites and fairly apathetic CADs. In attendance this time were Fred Davis, John Caruso, Jack McHugh, Jim Yerkey, Bob Odear, Mark Franceschini, and several people like Jeff Bohner and Tom Swider who were halfway listening and halfway playing Cosmic Encounter. I missed most of the meeting - when Mark and I got in from our Dune game the only topic left for discussion was Sacks' proposed resolution harshly condemning the DipCon Society for writing into its charter a provision governing its control over World DipCon when it comes to North America. We all agreed that DipCon had no real authority to dictate where World DipCon would be - such authority would be vested in a World DipCon Charter, now being drafted by folks on all three Hobby continents. The resulting Baltimore Resolution was a much more palatable one than that originally proposed by Robert Sacks, simply proposing ideas for site selection and proposing people to be included in the ongoing World DipCon Charter discussions. A copy of the resolution is printed elsewhere in this issue. The topic of World DipCon is also discussed elsewhere, and will

continue to be discussed in *DW* during the next several issues.

But back to the Con report. After some more late-night Family Business and games of the weird and wacky Kill Ted! card game, we got up on Sunday to do battle in Round Two of the Diplomacy tournament. Bob and Chris ended up on the same board, sharing a three-way draw with Eric Schlegel (MD), who had had a three-way the day before as well. There was another board besides mine but I do not believe that any of its players were in contention for the championship. My board was a power-packed one, with me as Germany, Frank Jones (MD) as France, Carl Willner (DC) as England, Harsh as Russia, Andrew Ofiesh (MA) as Austria, Michael Serle (NY) as Italy, and Jim Yerkey (MD) as Turkey.

AIR began by allying to hit the feared Yerkey as Turkey, and Jim really never had a chance. For the second time in as many games I participated in the FG to knock out England (Willner, also a feared diplomat). Harsh joined in the attack on England, but did not commit his forces fully to the assault. Before our business with England was finished Frank was hit hard by the Italian, and they settled into a war which would last the rest of the game. During this time I continued to work for England's elimination, fearing all the time a devastating AR attack on my unprotected homeland.

When Andrew put armies into Bohemia and Galicia unannounced I figured the time had come. Next move I ordered newly built armies into Silesia and Tyrolia, and attacked Russia in Scandinavia. If I were to be kicked in the butt at least I would go down fighting.

But AR inexplicably pulled back, saying (truthfully, I think) that Austria's earlier moves were a mistake and they really wanted a three-way with me. Well, I took them at their word and pulled back against England again, and put my Tyrolia army into Venice, a move that would eventually swing the FI was in France's favor. I took Rome the next

Continued on page 22

Demonstration Game

1989 AM Winter 1904/Spring 1905


England	Edi Birsan	950 Alla Ave Concord CA 94518
Germany	Steve Heinowski	860 Colorado Ave. #2A Lorain OH 44052
Italy	Steve Cooley	26723 Isabella Pkwy Canyon Country CA 91351
Russia	François Cuerrier	2303 Eglinton Ave E. #305 Scarborough ONT M1K 2N6 CANADA
Turkey	David Hood	104-F Terrace Dr. Cary NC 27511

Supply Center Chart

England	den,edi,lon,lpl,nwy,spa,swe = 7
Germany	bel,ber,bre,hol,kie,mar,mun,par,por = 9
Italy	bud,bul,gre,nap,rom,rum,ser,tri, tun,ven = 10
Russia	mos,sev,stp,war = 4
Turkey	ank,con,smy,vie = 4

Moves

England	Build F Lpl. F Lpl-Iri, F Nth-Eng, F Spa(sc) S German F Mid-Wes, A Fin-Lvn, A Nwy-Stp, F Bar S A Nwy-Stp, F Nat-Mid.
Germany	Build A Ber. F Mid-Wes, F Bot C English A Fin-Lvn, A Sil-War, <u>A Mun-Tyl</u> , A Boh S A Mun-Tyl, <u>A Mar-Pie</u> , A Gas S English F Spa(sc), A Ruh-Bur, A Ber-Pru.
Italy	A Bud-Tri, A Rum-Bud, A Bul-Con(d,gre,ser,rum,otb), F Eas-Smy, F Aeg S F Eas-Smy, <u>A Tyl S A Bud-Tri</u> , F Gre-Ion, <u>F Lyo-Pie</u> , <u>F Wes-Mid(d,naf,tun,tyn,otb)</u> , A Ven S A Tyl.
Russia	NBR! Plays one short. NMR! A Ukr H, <u>F Stp H(d,ann)</u> , A Sev H.
Turkey	Remove A Arm. <u>A Smy S F Con(d,ank,arm,syr,otb)</u> , F Bla-Bul(ec), F Con S F Bla-Bul(ec), <u>A Vie S Italian A Rum-Gal(NSQ)</u>



Commentary

Randolph Smythe: The Russian NMR is quite disappointing, at the least from the spectator's point of view. François had worked himself up to the point where with a winter 1904 build would have allowed him to make a credible defence in 1905. As it is, St. Petersburg and Warsaw are already gone, and a doubly supported A Livonia-Moscow would be unstoppable this Fall. Left with only 1 center, a Russian NMR would be understandable next year.

Italy is the only other player being hurt, though. Obviously England and Germany are loving it; and the speed of Russia's collapse must also please Turkey. As long as François held out against the north, it made sense to keep pressing David. Italy could ? try to lock up the Western Med; if ? been able to knock out Turkey

before the northern allies did the same to Russia, he'd have been within reach of a 3 way. Now, though, the idea of beating Turkey and stopping the stopping the fleets to the west and holding back the armies to the north, is looking like a ridiculous wish rather than a realistic strategy.

Setting aside the possibility that EG will start fighting each other, there is no sensible alternative to IT cooperating. Steve's press and David's order with Army Vierma this spring have sent the right signals but obviously both must go much further. With best play, I believe an IT alliance *could* still stop the EG machine, but every season's delay will likely cut their chances in half. If they can't get back together, this will be a short, and not-too-memorable game.

And the Winner Is...

by Pete Clark

"Any country can win in Diplomacy."

"All the Great Powers are basically equal."

These are two of the basic premises of Diplomacy. I've often wondered just how true they really were. Certainly anyone can *win*, but does everyone win about the same number of times? Are the countries equal; do all the countries do about the same over time? I finally decided to test these honored principles with a quantitative study — one that was as broad as possible. So, using *Everything* supply center charts, I gathered the information for my database.

300 games of Play-by-Mail Diplomacy played between 1982 and the present were included in the study. I felt that such a number would eliminate varying player skills from the variables that might affect the outcome. Also, only the games considered "regular" and ending after 1905 (unless some country won outright before then) were included. I decided not to attempt to judge the reasonableness of the draws, and counted them as recorded.

Table 1	Total Centers	Total Years	W	2w	3w	4w	5w
			Draws				
Austria	9844	1843	20	6	27	15	3
England	13512	2305	21	15	50	14	2
France	16203	2499	22	14	42	15	3
Germany	11430	1987	20	11	32	11	2
Italy	12308	2193	11	10	20	8	1
Russia	16287	2295	33	16	32	10	2
<u>Turkey</u>	<u>14600</u>	<u>2342</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	94184	15451	148	43	84	22	3
Average	13455	2207	21	12	36	13	2

Table 2	Average Number of Centers by Year							
Power	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08
Austria	4.5	4.3	4.8	5.0	5.4	5.5	6.9	7.4
England	4.3	4.5	4.9	5.2	5.8	6.8	8.3	9.0
France	4.8	5.1	5.6	6.3	6.8	7.5	8.7	8.9
Germany	4.9	5.0	5.0	5.6	6.0	6.3	7.0	7.5
Italy	4.1	4.4	4.9	5.2	5.4	5.6	6.7	7.5
Russia	5.5	5.8	6.2	6.6	7.6	9.0	9.5	10.1
Turkey	4.2	4.3	4.5	5.2	5.8	7.6	9.2	9.3

From this database, a lot of other things can be computed. With the information from Table 1 we can answer the first question: "Does every country win equally as much in PBM Diplomacy?"

The answer is **no**. Every country does win, but Italy with just 11 wins, a paltry 3.66% of all games played, does it half as often as the rest of the board. The average country wins over 21 times — approximately 7% of all games. And Russia wins half again as much as anybody else with 33 wins; an astounding 11% of all games played!

A statistic that caught me off guard was the total number of wins — almost 50% of all games ended with victory for one of the Great Powers. I would have guessed that number to be lower. It seems to me that there are an awful lot of draws in Dipdom, but I can't argue with the numbers — counted them twice!

Draws are also a type of victory, so I combined the total number of draws and wins together in Table 3. The results show that there are different groupings. Russia, France, England and Turkey are at the top of the heap in combined victories. Germany and Austria a step down the ladder. Poor Italy is all alone at the bottom with a involvement in the win only 1/6th of the time.

Table 3	Wins/Draws	% of Games
Austria	71	23.66
England	102	34.00
France	96	32.00
Germany	76	25.33
Italy	50	16.66
Russia	93	31.00
Turkey	101	33.66

To answer the second question, "Do all the Great Powers do approximately the same over time?", I had to compute a few other statistics as seen in Table 4.

Clearly, Austria and Germany do not get as many centers on average, or survive as long on average, as most of the others. When compared on the centers per year chart, they do better, which is perhaps to say that when they get eliminated, usually it is swiftly. France seems to be very durable in this study, surviving better (8.33 years) than any other nation. Thus, the question is again answered with a **no**. Countries fare very differently in the game of Diplomacy, and we need

Ratings

Table 4	Avg Cnts per Game	%	Avg Yrs per Game	Avg Cnts per Year
Austria	32.81	78	6.14	5.341
England	45.04	100	7.68	5.862
France	54.01	120	8.33	6.484
Germany	38.10	85	6.62	5.752
Italy	41.03	91	7.31	5.612
Russia	54.29	121	7.65	7.087
<u>Turkey</u>	<u>48.67</u>	<u>108</u>	<u>7.83</u>	<u>6.215</u>
Average	44.85		7.36	6.096

to be aware of that. To illustrate this, an overview of the statistics and what they mean for each country is in order.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY: Low man on the totem pole in 5 of the 10 tables and 6th in 3 of the remaining five. Only in wins, where Austria is average, and in 4 way draws is Austria out of the cellar. Why this is probably has to do with the position on the map. Many neighbors and densely packed centers make Austria a tempting target. There are few mediocre Austrian positions, you either do well or get destroyed.

ENGLAND: Average performance in 7 of the 10 tables. England is involved in more draws than any other country, probably because it is difficult to overcome when it has a lot of fleets, but conversely has trouble winning those same games. The difference between survival and victory is probably dependent on getting the right ratio of armies and fleets.

FRANCE: France is either 1st or 2nd in seven of the 10 tables and is 3rd in the rest. France's position in the game is strong in every respect, with good defensive and offensive prospects on every front. Always a tough customer, France has some inherent capabilities that can put it in or near the top of the hill in most games.

GERMANY: Germany is 6th in 4 of the 10 tables. In the rest it ranks 4th or 5th. An average number of wins along with a low number of average years surviving shows that, while Germany has potential, it must be realized early, probably at the expense of one of its many neighbors. Only Russia has a higher average number of centers in 1901.

ITALY: Interestingly, Italy is average when it comes to total centers and length of survival. It's number of wins and draws are abysmal — dead last. This is perhaps because Italy has a hard time doing *better* than average as shown on Table 2. This suggests that while Italy does O.K. in the opening stages of the game, it struggles to reach the 7 to 10 center positions needed to have a good chance at wins or draws.

RUSSIA: As Calhamer stated, Diplomacy is often very much a win or die situation for Russia. First in wins by a mile, Russia does only average in survival statistics and draws.

Russia's high count in average centers on Tables 2 and 4 certainly have something to do with starting with four home centers.

TURKEY: Turkey has perhaps the most interesting statistics in Table 2. Notice the abrupt rise in average number of centers starting about 1906. This suggests that perhaps one of the best strategies for Turkey is to lie low for the first few years, watching world events and developments then come out later with guns blazing. Turkey is another country that does no worse than third in all 10 of the tables. This is certainly due, in part at least, to its insular corner position.

All of these numbers, averages and statistics are, overall, probably little surprise to anyone. They mostly confirm what Diplomacy players already have long known from experience. I feel that the greatest impact these statistics might have is upon ratings systems and tournament scoring. Here we have hard evidence that all countries are not created equally and perhaps such mundane things as ratings and tournaments should take that into account for the sake of fairness.

Next time, I'm going to try the same thing for Gunboat — unless my wife divorces me for spending too much time with these "stupid game things." But isn't that a prerequisite (Rule 10) to becoming a member of the Senior Dip League? Ah, the joys of Dipdom!

>Pete Clark (7095 N Fruit #143, Fresno CA 93711) publishes a subzine in *Moire* called *Boot Hill*, and wishes to thank Don Williams and Matt Sundstrom for their help in preparing this article.

Dip Jargon For Novices

One of the purposes of *DW* is to soften the blow when newcomers enter the Hobby. If you are having trouble following the discussions in this zine by all means get in touch with the publisher and ask questions. For now, take a gander at the jargon defined below:

NMR	No Moves Received; refers to postal games
PBM	Play By Mail
PBEM	Play By Electronic Mail
DTRS	Dragonstooth Ratings System
Zine	Diplomacy or gaming magazine
Subzine	A regular publication which appears inside a zine
Standby	Replacement for player who has NMRed
Pubber	Publisher of a zine or subzine
DipCon	North American Diplomacy Championships

Proposed DipCon Scoring System: A Sketch

By Jim Burgess

Goals of the System:

1. Reward Winning and Taking Risks to Try to Win
2. Penalize the Largest Power in Large Draws for Failing to Play
3. Credit to Small Survivors with Incentives to Keep Playing

Master Scoring System: Don't use averages of any kind, reward people for playing as many games as possible. The total score is the simple sum of game scores from all of the games played. If you must, count only three scores or the three highest scores.

Game Scoring System: Modified 100 Point System (100 points for a win, 50 points for each player in a two way, 33 1/3 for each player in a three way, 25 for a four way, 20 for a five way, 16 2/3 for a six way, and 14 2/7 for a seven way (leave the 2/7 in as a mark of shame...)).

Modification 1: Subtract the difference between your supply center count and the count of the smallest member of the draw from the "100 Point System" score to get your score if you are a member of the draw.

Modification 2: Eliminated players get no points, but survivors get triple their final supply center count as their score.

Example: England defeats and eliminates France and Germany while a Russia/Turkey alliance defeats an Austria/Italy alliance. Italy is eliminated as well (all three eliminated players get a zero score and are properly chastised for abysmal play, especially on a strategic level). Austria teams up with RT to set up a stalemate line at the usual place with the final supply center counts and scores (four way draw):

AUSTRIA: 2 Supply Centers = $25 - (2-2) = 25$ points as a score. ENGLAND: 17 Supply Centers = $25 - (17-2) = 10$ points as a score. RUSSIA: 10 Supply Centers = $25 - (10-2) = 17$ points as a score. TURKEY: 5 Supply Centers = $25 - (5-2) = 22$ points as a score.

What? Unfair you say?? England and Russia have some pretty mighty incentives to do something other than agree to this draw; however, if Austria can make himself or herself absolutely essential to the stalemate line they might have to do so. I argue that Austria is the "winner" if this can be accomplished and the game will be far better for the attempt.

There are other draw possibilities though, let's look at them...here's the three way where Austria agrees to the survival as an alternative to being eliminated:

AUSTRIA: $2 \times 3 = 6$ points as a score. ENGLAND: $33 \frac{1}{3} - (17-5) = 21 \frac{1}{3}$ points as a score. RUSSIA: $33 \frac{1}{3} - (10-5) = 28 \frac{1}{3}$ points as a score. TURKEY: $33 \frac{1}{3} - (5-5) = 33 \frac{1}{3}$ points as a score.

England doesn't like this result too much either. Diplomacy is the way out, isn't it? We all can think of some options or England might just have to veto draws for awhile until the other three powers decide to do something. This is a cut-throat system and makes no apologies for it, it's time to get serious about the idea of a national champion. The two way results illustrate the more likely outcomes of this situation and the idea of this system is that it encourages the big powers to prove their worth (ER two way):

AUSTRIA: $2 \times 3 = 6$ points as a score. ENGLAND: $50 - (17-10) = 43$ points as a score. RUSSIA: $50 - (10-10) = 50$ points as a score. TURKEY: $5 \times 3 = 15$ points as a score.

Eliminating Austria and Turkey in this situation helps England's score but not Russia's, so if it is a locked up position where Austria and Turkey are vulnerable to stabs they probably would agree to this draw, but the temptation for Russia to stab them is not so great that they have no chance to survive. What about the win from this situation? Russia would stab if there was some chance of getting the win over England, since the downside risk is not too large as long as Russia can get all but a couple of the centers. For example, the win is worth 100 points (to whichever power can achieve it), but if Russia can get to 16 centers then England would get the 100 points, but Russia would get 48, only slightly less than the two way result. Of course, the incentive to go for the win in this kind of situation would be stronger if England were not so close to victory (a more likely occurrence). I strongly urge that some sort of system like this be used to get around problems that I've observed in other scoring systems. I'd appreciate feedback of any kind.

➤ Jim Burgess (100 Holden Street, Providence RI 02908) publishes the *Boob Report* and the *Abyssinian Prince*.

Ratings

Dragonstooth Postal Ratings System

All completed postal games through 1989 that were not local or otherwise irregular were rated, with the top 100 finishers listed below. The full listing is available for \$1 from DW. The Dragonstooth system gives 58 pts for win (minus 1/2 pt for each game year); 34 pts for draw (divided equally among powers in draw) plus 1 pt per center; 1 pt per center for survivals plus 1/2 pt per game year; and eliminated or dropped players receive a score based on the order they went out (-8, -6, -4, -2, 0 with ties getting the average thereof). There is a weighting procedure to favor players with more completed games, as well as a two-year cutoff to drop inactive players.

Player	Score	W	D	S	E	Dr
1. Gary Behnen	38.16	6	6			
2. Dave McCrumb	36.19	3	2			
3. Hugh Christie	34.20	3	2			
4. Mikel Petty	33.88	3	1			
5. Mike Ward	28.38	2	1			
6. Peter Fuchs	28.30	5	4	1	2	
7. David Hood	27.06	3			2	
8. Mark Berch	26.33	4	4	1	1	
9. Mark Fassio	25.51	1	8	1		
10. Phil Redmond	24.95	2	1	1		
11. Randolph Smyth	23.50	8	1	5	4	1
12. Mike Gonsalves	23.26	1	5	1		
13. Ron J. Brown	21.91	2	3		1	
14. Russ Rusnak	21.36	6	12	4	4	1
15. Fred Townsend	20.43	3	3	6	1	1
16. Jeff McKee	20.12	1	4	1	1	
17. John Rigley	20.02	1	1	1		
18. Frank Easton	19.80	1	1	1		
19. George Graessle	19.44	3	7		1	3
20. Peter Reese	19.36	1	3	3	1	
21. Bill Quinn	19.18	1	3	1	1	
22. Kevin Kozlowski	19.16	2	5	2	2	1
23. Steve Smith	19.14	1	2	2	1	
24. Tom Nash	19.07	1	4		2	
25. Glenn Sherril	19.01	1	1	2		
26. Tom Heinze	18.92		4	1		1
27. Kathy Caruso	18.85	8	19	17	8	
28. Tom Thomsen	18.79	2	3	1	2	
29. Dave Ditter	18.63	4	9	6	4	1
30. Mark Luedi	18.16			5	2	
31. N. Heintzman	18.02	2	13	3	4	1
32. Raymond Setzer	17.71	1	1	1		
33. Garret Schenck	17.60	1		1		
34. Mike Morris	17.19	1	3	3		1
35. Bob Aube	17.16		2	1		
36. Steve Heinowski	17.10	1	4	1	1	
Ron Cameron	17.10	1	1	1	1	
38. Steve Langley	17.02	1	6	2	1	
39. Steve Cooley	16.83	1	1			
40. James Young	16.61	1	1			1
41. J. Ron Brown	16.54	4	5	4	2	4
42. Cathy Ozog	16.35		4	3		
43. John Jordan	15.89	3		1	2	3
44. James Goode	15.74		2	3		
45. Ted Davis	16.69	1	1	3		
46. Mike Pustilnik	15.34	1	2	2	1	
47. Tom Boyd	15.31		3	1		
48. Steve Blunda	14.61		2			
49. Bob Slossar	14.57	1	3		1	2
50. James Wall	14.51	3	8	2	9	
51. Ken Hager	14.37	1	3	5	2	
52. Pat Hart	14.31	1	2	1	2	
53. Bob Nederlander	14.10		2			
54. S. Courtemanche	13.87		3	2	1	
55. George Rifle	13.85		2			
56. Larry Botimer	13.78	3	8	14	5	1
57. Carl Russel	13.64	1	2		2	
58. Tony Dousette	13.42		1	2		
59. Marc Peters	13.30	2	4	2	4	2
60. John Caruso	13.29	3	10	6	7	
61. Mike Mazzer	13.01	2	6	2	6	1
62. Don Picard	12.98	1		1	1	
63. Russ Blau	12.83		2			
64. Scott Drane	12.45	1		2	2	
65. Dave Carter	12.42		8	7	3	
66. Paul Gardner	12.28		1	6	6	5
67. Evans Givan	12.21	2	3	6	4	
68. Matt Kazur	11.88	1		1	1	
69. Stan Johnson	11.68	5	8	11	20	
70. Rob Lowes	11.62		2	2	1	
71. Tom O Shea	11.35		2			
72. Chris Lee	11.22	1			1	
73. Bruce Geryk	10.98		2	1	1	
74. David Pierce	10.90	1	3	5	5	1
75. Bob Olsen	10.84		10	10	5	2
76. Blair Cusack	10.70	5	4	1	4	14
77. Pete Gaughan	10.68		3	5	2	
78. Rick Wright	10.45		2			1
79. Elmer Hinton	10.30	1	1	1		1
80. Les Casey	10.12	1			2	
81. Bob Addison	9.93	1	1	2	1	3
82. Don Tinker	9.88		4	3	1	1
83. Mike Henry	9.87	1	1	1	3	1
84. Hugh Polley	9.84		5	3	4	1
85. Melinda Holley	9.75	1	19	23	16	
86. Pierre Touchette	9.69	1	4	8	4	2
87. Dick Martin	9.64	3	4	8	11	2
88. Vince Manna	9.35	1			1	1
89. Vince Lutterbie	9.32		3	4		1
90. Fred Wiedemeyer	9.29		5	6	4	1
91. Doug Brown	9.18		1	1		
Dan Marshall	9.18		2			
Mickey Preston	9.18		1	1		
94. Paul Rauterberg	9.02	3	7	7	11	6
Ben Schilling	9.02		7	5	4	
96. Simon Billenness	8.93		1	1		
Susan Welter	8.93		1	1	2	
98. David Anderson	8.91	1	3	7	7	
99. Edi Birsan	8.85		2	1	2	
Don Scheifler	8.85	1	1	4	5	

Best Dippers in the World: 1989

By Don Del Grande

These are the final 1989 International Diplomacy Tournament Rankings, based on the system described in the sidebar. The list below contains the top fifty finishers plus ties. Once again, the ManorCon winner finished first overall, based solely on his ManorCon win. This won't happen again due to the 1990 system, also described in the sidebar. As far as 1990 goes, already Harry Kolotas has 207 points from three Australian tournaments. Even two wins (e.g. at ManorCon and MidCon) are worth only 200. The top nine World DipCon finishers scored 100, 88, 76, 65, 53, 41, 30, 18 and 6 points respectively. Note that Jason Bergmann, the 1990 World DipCon champ, also got 29 points at Origins.

1.	Paul Oakes	UK	38
2.	Steve Cooley	USA	36
3.	Toby Harris	UK	32
4.	Phil Ralph	UK	30
5.	Steve Gould	ASL	28
6.	Andrew England	ASL	26
7.	Matt McVeigh	UK	25
8.	Hohn Cho	USA	24
	James Vickers	ASL	24
10.	John Cain	ASL	23
	Pete Mason	UK	23
12.	Frank Jones	USA	21
	Robert Wessels	ASL	21
14.	L. Clutterbuck	ASL	20
	Harry Kolotas	ASL	20
	Bill Sexton	USA	20
	R. Stephenson	ASL	20
	Mark Twitty	USA	20
19.	Martin Sanders	UK	19
20.	Simon Bouton	UK	18
	Jim Mills	UK	18
	Darryl Winder	ASL	18
23.	Nick Beliaeff	USA	17
24.	Steve Kilmer	USA	16
	Ken League	USA	16
	Dave McCrumb	USA	16
	Tim Minnig	USA	16
28.	Fred Hyatt	USA	15
	Bob Sendrick	UK	15
	Neil Smark	ASL	15
31.	Lance Anderson	USA	13
32.	Morgan Gurley	USA	12

1989 IDTR Rating System

1. First place is worth the square root of (10 X the number of players), rounded down,
2. Each subsequent place is worth 4/5 of the place above it, also rounded down. (The 4/5 is taken from the previous place's final rating and not the pre-rounded value.)
3. Ties are resolved by calculating ratings for enough places separately and giving each person the average of those ratings, rounded down. (For example, if two persons are tied for fourth, each receive the average of fourth-fifth places, rounded down, and the next place awarded is sixth.)

1990 IDTR Rating System

1. First place is worth 100 points in any tournament with 30 or more players (subtract 10 for each player short of 30.)
2. Subsequent places score $100 \times [N - (10 \times P) / N]$ rounded down, where N is the number of persons in the tournament and P is the number of places below first (P = 1 for second place, 2 for third, and so on). No one scores below zero.
3. Ties are handled as in the 1989 system - see (3) above.

	Rob Lowes	CAN	12
	Wes Barton	USA	12
	Alan Sharples	UK	12
	Brad Wilson	USA	12
	Scott Cox	USA	12
38.	Steve Jones	UK	10
39.	Tim Haffey	USA	9
	Bill LaFosse	CAN	9
	Frank Meerbach	ASL	9
	Kevin Neal	USA	9
	Dan Sellers	USA	9
	John Caruso	USA	9
	Matthew Gibson	ASL	9
46.	Jeff McKee	USA	8
47.	Chris Kremer	USA	7
	David Elliott	CAN	7
	Adrian Fegan	ASL	7
	Thorin Munro	ASL	7
	Mark Murray	USA	7
	James Gardener	USA	7
	Carl Walter	USA	7

➤ Don Del Grande (142 Eliseo Drive, Greenbrae CA 94904) publishes *A Sharp Mind and a Straight Knife*.

Jim and Dan Do Atlanta

by Jim Yerkey

I came away from ORIGINS '90 in Atlanta with four impressions: the Hilton Towers is an excellent facility for gaming, Dragon Con attracts more women than any gaming event I've ever been to (many of them were barely clad in the barest of D&D type costumes), it's not a good practice to leave your car parked on a downtown Atlanta street over night, and the people that ran it could do themselves a lot of good by taking lessons from the folks at AtlantiCon, DixieCon, the late great MaryCon, and everybody else in the "Con" business.

After attending DixieCon/DipCon/World DipCon I arranged to spend the following week calling on some of my business contacts in the southeast and then to attend ORIGINS the following weekend. I was joined for the weekend by my old associate and (after getting the better of him in the first game we played there) former friend Dan Mathias.

Things were going bad well before we made the trek south. Despite repeated attempts to get information as to tournament times, number of rounds, fees for playing in the tournaments, etc. I had received nothing from them. Dan had sent his registration info in (sans Dip tournament info) months before and had gotten no reply. So, when I picked him up at the Atlanta airport (that's a different adventure for another time) and headed for the Hilton, we were flying blind.

We arrived at ORIGINS at about 11:00PM Thursday and were informed by ORIGINS security that we could not register because no one knew where the registrars were. Nor could they provide us with an ORIGINS booklet because no one knew where they were either. Dan, using the Diplomatic prowess he has come to be known for, smooth talked these Junior Gestapo Agents into taking us to their leader. There we found a little cooperation, and more importantly, the elusive ORIGINS booklets.

We found that we had already missed the 1st round of Diplomacy (6:00PM Thursday) and that we would miss the 2nd round which started at 2:00AM (that's right AM) Friday if we didn't find a way to get registered. The tournament was set up to run at 6:00PM and 2:00AM on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday. Additional rounds were added at 9:00AM on Saturday and Sunday.

Well, we the unpaid were again informed we would have to leave. We headed back to our rental digs at El'Cheapo Motel, south of the city, and I started calling the Hilton to see if I could locate anyone with some authority, other than the Guards. It was like calling the Federal Social Security Administration. Nobody knew nothin' and everybody passed me off to someone else. I gave up after about 30 minutes. "Smoothy Dan" took over and in no time had talked the

Security people into letting us back in to play. But, we were not to wander around the facility.

We took an hour and a half nap, showered and headed for the Hilton again, getting there just in time to be included on the last of 4 boards.

Danny drew France and put together an alliance with Germany to dispose of England. I drew Austria and put together an AIR alliance. Russia sent two units south to secure Rumania and his Southern flank. All of his other units, for the entire game, fought in Germany, and Scandinavia, as well as England. Italy took Tunis, and then sent two Fleets to help m against Turkey.

As Turkey was subdued, Italy redirected his attention to the West. By this time Russia was creating havoc for France and Germany around England. So much so that Dan had to send a Fleet up into the North Atlantic and the Norwegian. This, of course, meant that he was unprotected at home. Italy took full advantage of the situation taking Marseille and Spain before France could stop him.

Then smooth-talking Danny struck pay dirt. He convinced Austria (me), who had finished off Turkey, to come to his aid. I caught Italy as much off guard and out of position as he had caught France. And while Dan was retaking his lost supply centers, I was able to take over the most of the rest of Italy. Russia and I then began a march to the Atlantic. As happens in tournaments two things became obvious: one, that Russia and I had the upper hand and, two, that we were all tired and running out of time. So, the remaining 5 players voted a two way Russian/Austrian draw.

It was now about 8:00AM and Registration was open. We got into line and signed up for Diplomacy and Shogun. In the Registration area we bumped into several Dipsters including Bob Odear and the soon to be expecting Mrs. Odear, Don Del Grande, and the previous weekend's winner Jason Bergmann.

We were now planning to get some shuteye. Upon arriving at my car we found the back quarter window had been broken out and my case of cassette tapes gone.

In the 6:00PM Friday round Dan was a part of a three way draw as France. In my second game I drew Germany. This game was one of those long, fiercely fought affairs which go nowhere. It ended in what was basically a four player dead lock, although there were six players on the board at the end. The ensuing discussion about who was to be in a draw, etc. lasted forever. I finally voted myself out of it so I could get some rest before the 2:00AM round began; as it was already close to 1:00AM.

Once again I drew Germany. England began immedi-

ORIGINS 90 Final Results

ately pushing for a Western Triple. I was wary of this arrangement at first and quickly found that France was as well. So we cooked up a scheme wherein we would go along with England until the time was right to get him out of our "back yard". I, of course, had further plans (just as I'm sure both of them did) to make sure that I got the lion's share of all the spoils. I endeavored to get both of them in positions from which they could do me no harm.

As the game progressed I encouraged France to build fleets so he could "better attack into the Med". Additionally I pointed out that having all those fleets would come in handy when it came time for France and I to cut England out of the deal. France played the entire game with 2 armies.

Conversely I tried to convince England that he needed to build armies to be able to conquer Russia. If my recollection is correct he played the entire game with two fleets. I was running a risk, being flanked by his armies in Scandinavia and Russia, but so long as France built fleets I was not really surrounded. Obviously there would be a natural tendency on the part of France to go after England, no matter how much diplomatic effort England put into turning him around, because of this imbalance of French fleets vs armies.

Much to my relief/disbelief this strategy worked to a "T", even better!

The three of us moved quickly and quietly enough that the eastern powers were late getting their defenses organized and set up. England and I trashed Russia very quickly with Turkey jumping in to grab Sevastopol. I also made some gains in Austria and helped France against Italy. Despite their best diplomatic efforts Turkey and Austria could not split this western triple. France and I agreed that the taking of the last Italian supply center would be the start of the assault on England. Because I was going to carry on the battle against AT, France would begin the attack alone. With the build resulting from his conquest of the final Italian center, France would build a fleet in Brest.

Reading of that Fall's moves revealed not only the aforementioned fleet in Brest but that Turkey and Austria had decided to call it a day, as it was now between 7:30 and 8:00AM and everybody was wearing down. They both went into civil disorder (CD). I personally thought they were significantly premature in giving up. In light of the coming French stab of England they were, I'm sure, regretting their decisions.

This, of course, put me in the driver's seat. France had his only 2 armies in Italy and all but one of his fleets were in the area. Therefore he could not mount a viable offense against me while I could do him some real damage by throwing several of my armies into his homeland. I was also in position to potentially grab all of the CD supply centers while keeping the English units pretty much bottled up in Russia. I estimated I could handle any two of these chores. To handle all three

1. Jim Yerkey
2. Stan Plummer
3. Gabe Dambaugh
4. Garth Thorpe
5. Jeff Freymuller
6. Bart DePalma
7. Jason Bergmann
8. Robert Albrecht

- Best Austria: Jim Yerkey
Best England: Gabe Dambaugh
Best France: Stan Plummer
Best Germany: Jim Yerkey
Best Italy: Jerry Steffer
Best Russia: Chris Senler
Best Turkey: Garth Thorpe

would have taken some luck, and I was beginning to run down like Austria and Turkey. I decided to try to bluff my way into a win.

Pointing out my tactical advantage to France, as well as the problem he would have getting England to trust him as a result of his building a fleet in Brest (that had been outlawed in a previous agreement between the three of us), I convinced him to support my attempt to get the win. He would, of course, get to keep the supply centers he already had.

With his support behind me I made an offer to England. He could keep his supply centers, I would get all the CD'd centers and get the win with 19 centers. England was pretty upset, just as most of us are when we're stabbed, and it took a little time but he finally saw he could not get himself into a draw and gave in.

The CD by the Austrian and Turkish players obviously was the key point in the win. Sometimes you get help from directions you would never dream of.

The Diplomacy Tournament was run by Mike and Matt Kelly of MaryCon fame. Within the confines of the time, space, and scheduling limitations which were handed to them they did a good job. They used the MaryCon scoring system: 1 point for each supply center held when the game ends, and a 34 point bonus pool to be divided up evenly amongst all players involved in the result (34 points to a sole winner, 17 points to both parts of a 2 way draw, etc.). To my knowledge, however, no effort was made to separate friends. The playing times were a pain, as was the registration problems illustrated above. Those were not under the control of the Kellys.

I would have liked to see a larger turnout. The final two rounds (one of which was added to the schedule after the tournament began) were cancelled for lack of interest. The total number of players was only 85; and many of them only played one round. The skill level of the players ran from those who didn't know the rules all the way up to Dip master Jason Bergmann.

ORIGINS '91 will be back in Baltimore next year. We are looking for a big turnout and an exciting tournament.

➤ Jim Yerkey (4 Dutton Avenue, Baltimore MD 21228) is the 1990 Origins Diplomacy Champion.

continued from page 13

spring, while Frank took Spain and was supported by me into Edinburgh for the end of England. AR, who really should have attacked me while they had the chance as they would have easily secured a two-way, felt my knife in the Fall as I bounced the Austrians in Venice and sent units into the Baltic and Prussia. I was confident that with expected Italian help (he was supposedly pissed at the Austrian's seizure of Naples and attempted seizure of Venice) that we would prevail against the fleet-poor AR in the Med for a virtually identical end to my game the previous day.

I miscalculated. Italy instead sided his two, pivotal fleets with the AR and they kicked butt in the Med. Meanwhile I was not doing that well in Germany proper, with the fall of Munich fairly imminent. Progress in Scandinavia was tangible, but slow. At this point I feared AR could take us down and declare a two-way for themselves. Time for a little trickery.

Frank and I both feigned confidence in our ability to hold the stalemate line, which after heated discussion was accepted as fact by Andrew and Harsh. We declared a four-way with Austria deemed to have control of Munich. Fact is that they may have broken our line, although perhaps not in time to beat the 6:00 ending time.

At any rate, now was the time for the scoring system debacle. Either Chris or Bob was certain to win, right, since they were the only players with a 2way and a 3way? Wrong! Sacks' system rewards 2.5 for the 4way and 3.3 for the 3way plus one whole point for each center held at the end. There is also up to one point awarded based on the supply center count of each year prior to the end of a game. Under this system Andrew OFiesh beat out Chris for the championship despite having a weaker second-day finish because he had one more center than Chris each day!

So a 2way/4way beats a 2way/3way for the win. Robert is proud of his system and has used it consistently with minor modifications for some 10 years, but the award per center

The Baltimore Resolution of 1990

Adopted at the AtlantiCon Diplomacy Hobby Meeting

1. No organization except World DipCon itself can effectively claim to administer World DipCon.
2. Any World DipCon Charter supersedes any provisions of any other organization concerning World DipCon.
3. It is the sense of the meeting that the site selection procedure for World DipCon when it is to be held in North America should involve a poll of the hobby, such as the publishers of Diplomacy magazines and/or of attendees at all the Diplomacy conventions in North America.
4. It is the sense of the meeting that David Hood, Don Del Grande, Robert Sacks, and Cal White join the ad hoc committee drafting the World DipCon Charter.

must be too large if a 9 center 4way/12 center 2way finish is deemed better than a 8 center 3way, 11 center 2way finish. See Robert's defense of his system along with the full tournament results elsewhere in this issue.

Cons like AtlantiCon are fun because there are so many new people to play games with and so many games to participate in. The drawback is lack of space and lack of playing time in the Diplomacy event. We had about 1/4 of a large room devoted to the tournament, unlike at DixieCon/DipCon where the whole thing was basically geared towards Diplomacy. People have debated for years whether our national Diplomacy championship, DipCon, should be held at smaller Dip-only Cons like DixieCon or larger gaming Cons like AtlantiCon. At big Cons there are more people, and more new people to bring into the PBM/PEEM Diplomacy Hobby. At smaller Cons there are no time limits, higher status for the Dip tournament, and a more congenial Hobby atmosphere. My advice is to go to tournaments of both kinds and see which you prefer. You will find that both types of Diplomacy tournaments can be a lot of fun if you adjust your expectations accordingly.

AtlantiCon's Replacement Controversy

By Robert Sacks

At the 1990 AtlantiCon, there was a controversy concerning the replacement player procedures at a Diplomacy tournament. In Round Two, Board Two the England in 1901 was held to 3 centers by France, Germany and Russia. He resigned, giving as reason (among others) that the position was dead. It has always been my unstated policy that when a player resigns, if he requests replacement and the position is significant (more than two centers or less if in crucial

location) we would try to replace him, but if he ordered civil disorder, he would not be replaced. In my opinion (and everybody else in the area) a 3-center England in 1901 is hardly dead, but I took the player's statement as final.

Jim Yerkey, seconded by everyone who expressed an opinion except David Hood and myself, argued that the tournament staff should not allow a player to throw away a position and ruin the game for the other players. In this case,

England's resignation destroyed Italy's position, and the game ended in 1904 as a 3way draw (which had to be explained to an incredulous Tournament Director).

David Hood argued against both Yerkey's and my positions, but from opposite directions. He said that the player's determination as to whether he is to be replaced is binding, and the Tournament Director should even replace 1 center positions if requested. The reason we have never replaced insignificant positions at AtlantiCon is to avoid harassment.

I am undecided whether to adopt the Yerkey position on this issue. Fairness to the other players on the board and in the tournament is the major reason for tournament staff discretion, the other being a desire to avoid an extensive rulebook.

➤ Robert Sacks (4861 Broadway 5-V, New York NY 10034) publishes *Hansard*.

David Hood Comments

My problem with the Yerkey position on this subject is that a player always has the option to "throw away a position and ruin the game for the other players" as Robert puts it above. People both in tournament and postal Diplomacy do this all the time, by suiciding against one particular country, handing someone a win based on criteria outside the game, etc. So as a matter of theoretical precision it should make no

difference whether the player does so by submitting moves or by intentionally not submitting moves. Intervening to stop a player from ruining his own country would obviously be rank GM interference with the game, so intervening to stop a player from having all his units ordered perpetually to hold is also GM interference.

This question becomes even more clear if the Tournament Director allows perpetual orders to be submitted by a player wishing or needing to leave early or to take an extended break. Subject to certain safeguards I have always allowed perpetual orders at my DixieCon Diplomacy tournament, so my hands are tied as concerns a player wishing to submit perpetual all-units-hold orders. There is no principled way to argue that such orders are invalid as opposed to perpetual orders which call for unit movement. And the general disallowance of perpetual orders will actually worsen the game when a player has to leave early and a replacement is unavailable, since a power would then sit with all units holding rather than the more sensible perpetual orders the player wanted to submit.

Finally, it should be noted that the controversy in question here is one very unlikely to resurface. A player who gives up or leaves early rarely says he wants his units to hold - he usually would have no problem with the GM attempting to find a replacement player. In addition, I would propose that the presumption be to use a replacement player unless the original player says otherwise.

A Defense of the AtlantiCon System

By Robert Sacks

As to the question about Andrew Ofiesh beating Chris Kremer this year for the AtlantiCon championship, I have no problem with the result. My tournament scoring system is described in Table A. As shown in the raw data in Table B, Ofiesh clearly outplayed Kremer. The only surprise is that Kremer marginally outscores Ofiesh on the second round. If we were to ignore the supply center history component and look at points only for draws and final center counts, the scores would have been Ofiesh at 30.5 (14+5+9+2.5) and Kremer at 30.333 (14+5+8+3.333). This would disregard the fact that when they played on the same board, Ofiesh had 8 more centers during the course of the game than did Kremer.

Now, if V = points for victory, W = weight for centers in final year, and L = weight for centers in preceding years, for Kremer to beat Ofiesh you would need:

$$V > 12 [1 + 8L/10L + W - L(5W - 6L)/(W + 3L)(W + 6L)]$$

For L=1, W=10, V would have to exceed 14.268 centers. For L=0, V would have to equal 12 centers. So the weight given for the supply center history of the game makes little impact

on the calculus beyond that it was intended to: as a tiebreaker.

Ofiesh	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11
Rnd 1	5	5	6	7	9	10	10	12	13	13	14
Rnd 2	5	7	7	7	7	8	8	9			

Kremer

Rnd 1	4	6	7	6	6	7	10	10	12	14	14
Rnd 2	5	5	7	8							

$$\text{Ofiesh } 16.500 + 10.750 = 27.250$$

$$\text{Kremer } 16.100 + 10.795 = 26.895$$

The player's score for the tournament is the sum of the scores in each round. The score for the round has two parts, one based on the supply center chart and one based on the share of the victory. The count on the chart is reduced for units not built for lack of available home centers and subsequently not built for loss of centers. The score for the chart is the average with the final year weighted 10. The score for victory is 10 for a solo winner, 5 for each player in a 2way draw, 3.333 for each player in a 3way draw, etc.

Zines

Perhaps the biggest news on the Diplomacy magazine front this fall is the reappearance of the zine *Ponteviedria*. This zine lists game openings of Diplomacy and other games being offered by postal zines throughout North America. This is an invaluable service for newcomers into the Hobby and others eager to get into a postal game but are unsure where to start. While some game opening info is available in zine review zines such as *The Zine Register* (Tom Nash, 202 Settler's Road, St Simon's Island GA 31522) it is often out of date. The zine that used to be relied upon for up-to-date info was *Known Game Openings*, but that zine has not appeared since early last fall.

Phil Reynolds (2896 Oak St, Sarasota FL 34237) has assumed the editorship of the new *Ponteviedria*, and promises to keep the zine more up to date by watching out for game openings and keeping his listing current for whenever a request comes in. To get the most recent listing, send a self-addressed stamped envelope to Phil. Another option is to send him \$3 to receive the zine for an entire year. His August 1990 edition looks fairly complete, so a very useful service to the Hobby seems to have been revived.

There are also several new zines out which are of note. Bruce Reiff (3240 Rocker Drive, Cincinnati OH 45239) has published his first issue of *Diplomacy Downs*. The zine features game openings in Diplomacy, Gunboat, and Ohio-only Diplomacy as well as a trivia contest and the

promise of a letter column to discuss sports and politics.

Another new zine is *Diplomatic Immunity*, to be published by Mike Legg (541 West 15th #51, Escondido CA 92025). Yes, this is the same Mike Legg who has made a splash selling his Diplomacy conference map postcards. Mike is looking for Diplomacy players, and will start his zine as soon as he gets enough players. I would urge players to look up either Mike or Bruce for a game — often you will get to play against a wider variety of people than in the older, more established zines.

A new subzine of note has begun to appear in Tim Moore's *Moire* (405 Fair Dr #101, Costa Mesa CA 92626). *Boot Hill* is the subzine, put out by Pete Clark (7095 N Fruit #143, Fresno CA 93711) for the major purpose of running two Diplomacy games featuring some of the brightest stars in the Hobby. His two games have certainly attracted big names, including DTRS #1 player Gary Behnen, and will include commentary on the games by David Hood. These games should be fun for player and onlooker alike, so you might want to keep up with the action by subscribing to *Moire*.

Of course, if you do so, make sure the issues you receive really are from Tim Moore. The zine was faked quite masterfully in late August, and fooled many till they began to notice that in one game all moves failed and in another every player NMRed! Tom Nash is the chief suspect.

Diplomacy World

104-F Terrace Drive, Cary NC 27511

Fall 1990

No. 60

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
CARY, N.C.
PERMIT #344